arXiv:alg-geom/9603009v3 13 Aug 1996

A Note on the Cohomology of Moduli of Rank Two Stable Bundles

Richard Earl

March 12, 1996

0 Introduction

In recent years the cohomology ring of the moduli space $\mathcal{N}_g(2,d)$ of rank two and odd degree d stable bundles over a Riemann surface M of genus $g \geq 2$ has been extensively studied [2], [5], [10], [11]. The subring $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ of $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})$ which is invariant under the induced action of the mapping class group Γ of M has also been much studied and has been shown to play a central role in the ring structure of $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})$.

In 1991 Zagier [11] began a study of certain relations in the invariant cohomology ring. These are defined recursively in terms of Newstead's generators α, β, γ [7] by

$$(r+1)\zeta_{r+1} = \alpha\zeta_r + r\beta\zeta_{r-1} + 2\gamma\zeta_{r-2} \tag{1}$$

with $\zeta_0 = 1$ and $\zeta_r = 0$ for $r < 0$. Each of the authors [2], [5], [10], [11] showed that ζ_r is a relation in $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ for $r \geq g$ and that $\zeta_g, \zeta_{g+1}, \zeta_{g+2}$ generate the relation ideal of the invariant cohomology ring. King and Newstead further proved a decomposition theorem [5, Prop.2.5], originally conjectured by Mumford, describing $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})$ in terms of $H^*(\mathcal{N}_k(2,d);\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ $(k \leq g)$ and exterior powers of $H^3(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})$.

The methods employed by the authors [2], [5], [10], [11] differ greatly from Kirwan's original proof [6, §2] of Mumford's conjecture. Mumford introduced relations in $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})$ which are constructed from the vanishing Chern classes of a rank $2g-1$ bundle $\pi_!V$ over $\mathcal{N}_g(2,d)$ and conjectured that these relations are complete. Zagier [11, §6] showed that the relations $\zeta_r, r \geq g$ form a subset of the Mumford relations and for this reason we will refer to the vanishing ζ_r as the Zagier-Mumford relations.

The purpose of this note is two-fold. We will firstly rederive the result that the first three Zagier-Mumford relations form a minimal complete set for the invariant cohomology. The second result is to prove a subsequent and stronger version of Mumford's conjecture; namely we will show that the relations constructed solely from the first vanishing Chern class $c_{2g}(\pi_!V)$ freely generate the relation ideal of $H^*(\mathcal{N}_g(2,d);\mathbf{Q})$ as a $\mathbf{Q}[\alpha,\beta]$-module. Both results follow easily from Kirwan's calculations in [6, §2]. Partly the aim of this note is to demonstrate the power of the methods of [6] which currently is the only approach to have generalised to the rank three case [3].

For ease of notation we will from now on write $\mathcal{N}$ for $\mathcal{N}_g(2,d)$ and write $\mathcal{N}_0$ for the moduli space of rank two odd degree stable bundles of fixed determinant. Also we write $\bar{g}$ for $g-1$ and $[2g]$ for the set $\{1,...,2g\}$.

1 Kirwan's Approach

Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the space of all holomorphic structures on a fixed C^∞ complex vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ over M of rank two and odd degree d and let $\mathcal{G}_c$ denote the group of all C^∞ complex automorphisms of $\mathcal{E}$. We may then identify $\mathcal{N}$ with the quotient $\mathcal{C}^s/\mathcal{G}_c$ where $\mathcal{C}^s \subset \mathcal{C}$ is the open subset consisting of stable holomorphic structures. Let $\mathcal{G}$ denote the gauge group of all C^∞ automorphisms of $\mathcal{E}$ which are unitary with respect to a fixed Hermitian structure and let $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ denote the quotient of $\mathcal{G}$ by its $U(1)$ centre.

Then $H^*(\mathcal{N};\mathbf{Q})$ is naturally isomorphic to $H^*_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q})$ [1, 9.1], and Atiyah and Bott show further [1, thm.7.14] that the restriction map

$$H^*(B\overline{\mathcal{G}};\mathbf{Q}) \cong H^*_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q}) \cong H^*(\mathcal{N};\mathbf{Q}) \tag{2}$$

is surjective. They construct a rank two $\mathcal{G}$-equivariant holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{V}$ over $\mathcal{C} \times M$ and define generators

$$a_1, a_2, f_2 \text{ and } b_1^s, b_2^s \quad (s \in [2g]) \tag{3}$$

for $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q}) = H^*(B\mathcal{G};\mathbf{Q})$ by taking the slant products

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}) = a_r \otimes 1 + \sum_{s=1}^{2g} b_r^s \otimes e_s + f_r \otimes \omega$$

where $e_1, ..., e_{2g}$ is a fixed basis for $H^1(M;\mathbf{Q})$ and ω is the standard generator for $H^2(M;\mathbf{Q})$. The only relations amongst the generators (3) are that a_1, a_2, f_2 commute with everything and that the b_i^s anticommute amongst themselves.

Rather than (2) we shall consider the surjection

$$H^*_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q}) \otimes \mathbf{Q}[a_1] \cong H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q}) \cong H^*(\mathcal{N};\mathbf{Q}) \otimes \mathbf{Q}[a_1]. \tag{4}$$

The images of (3) under this map form generators for $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q})$ which we will also refer to as a_1, a_2, f_2, b_1^s, b_2^s and the relations among these restrictions form the kernel of (4). In order to study this kernel we introduce a $\mathcal{G}$-perfect stratification of $\mathcal{C}$ due to Shatz [9].

Any unstable holomorphic bundle E over M of rank n and degree d has a canonical filtration (or flag) [4, p.221] which in the rank $n = 2$ case is a line subbundle L of E of degree d_1 such that $d_1 > d/2$. We define the type of E to be $(d_1, d - d_1)$ and define the type of a stable bundle to be $\mu_0 = (d/2, d/2)$. The stratum $\mathcal{C}_\mu \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is the set of all holomorphic vector bundles of type μ and we construct a total order $\preceq$ on the set of types by writing $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \preceq (\nu_1, \nu_2)$ if $\mu_1 \leq \nu_1$.

Kirwan's proof of Mumford's conjecture is based upon a set of completeness criteria for a set $\mathcal{R}$ of relations in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})$ [6, Prop.1]. These criteria involve finding for each $\mu \neq \mu_0$ relations $\mathcal{R}_\mu \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ which in a technical sense correspond to the stratum $\mathcal{C}_\mu$. We introduce here similar completeness criteria for the invariant cohomology:

PROPOSITION 1 *(Invariant Completeness Criteria) Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a subset of the kernel of the restriction map*

$$H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q}). \tag{5}$$

Suppose that for each unstable type μ there is a subset $\mathcal{R}_\mu$ of the ideal generated by $\mathcal{R}$ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ such that the restriction of $\mathcal{R}_\mu$ to $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\nu;\mathbf{Q})$ is zero when $\nu \prec \mu$ and when $\nu = \mu$ equals the ideal generated by e_μ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$, where e_μ denotes the equivariant Euler class of the normal bundle to $\mathcal{C}_\mu$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{R}$ generates the kernel of the restriction map (5) as an ideal of $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$.

PROOF: We include now the main points in the proof of the above proposition. However the only difference between this proof and the argument of [3, prop.4] is to observe that $\mathcal{C}_\mu$ is Γ-invariant and hence $e_\mu \in H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$.

For μ an unstable type let $\mu - 1$ denote the type previous to μ with respect to $\preceq$ and define $V_\mu = \bigcup_{\nu \preceq \mu} \mathcal{C}_\nu$. Then V_μ is an open subset of $\mathcal{C}$ which contains $\mathcal{C}_\mu$ as a closed submanifold.

Let d_ν denote the complex codimension of $\mathcal{C}_\nu$ in $\mathcal{C}$. For any given $i \geq 0$ there are only finitely many $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $2d_\nu \leq i$ [1, 7.16] and so for each $i \geq 0$ there exists some μ such that

$$H^i_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q}) = H^i_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q}).$$

Hence it is enough to show that for each μ the image in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ of the ideal generated by $\mathcal{R}$ contains the image in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ of the kernel of (5). Note that the above is clearly true for $\mu = \mu_0$ as $V_{\mu_0} = \mathcal{C}^s$. We will proceed by induction with respect to $\preceq$.

Assume now that $\mu \neq \mu_0$ and that $\zeta \in H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ lies in the kernel of (5). Suppose that the image of ζ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_{\mu-1};\mathbf{Q})$ is in the image of the ideal generated by $\mathcal{R}$. We may, without any loss of generality, assume that the image of ζ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_{\mu-1};\mathbf{Q})$ is zero. Then by the exactness of the Thom-Gysin sequence

$$\cdots \to H^{*-2d_\mu}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_{\mu-1};\mathbf{Q}) \to \cdots$$

there exists an element $\eta \in H^{*-2d_\mu}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ which is mapped to the image of ζ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ by the Thom-Gysin map. The composition

$$H^{*-2d_\mu}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$$

is given by multiplication by e_μ which is not a zero-divisor in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ [1, p.569]. Hence the restriction of ζ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ is ηe_μ and by our initial observation $\eta \in H^{*-2d_\mu}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$. By hypothesis there exists

θ in $\mathcal{R}_\mu$ whose image in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ equals ηe_μ.

Kirwan shows [6, p.867] that the direct sum of restriction maps

$$H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \to \bigoplus_{\nu \preceq \mu} H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\nu;\mathbf{Q}) \tag{6}$$

is injective. The images of θ and ζ under (6) are equal and hence the restrictions of θ and ζ to $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(V_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ are the same, completing the proof. $\square$

2 The Mumford and Zagier-Mumford Relations

The group $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ acts freely on $\mathcal{C}^s$ and the $U(1)$-centre of $\mathcal{G}$ acts as scalar multiplication on the fibres of $\mathcal{V}$. The projective bundle of $\mathcal{V}$ descends to a holomorphic projective bundle over $\mathcal{N}\times M$ which is the projective bundle of a universal holomorphic bundle V of rank two and odd degree [1, p.580].

The bundle V is universal in the sense that the restriction of V to $[E]\times M$ for any class $[E]\in\mathcal{N}$ is isomorphic to E. Note V is not unique; we may tensor V by the pullback of a line bundle over $\mathcal{N}$ to produce a second bundle with the same universal property. However we may normalise V [6, p.857, p.877] by requiring the relation

$$f_2 = (d-2\bar{g})a_1 + \sum_{s=1}^{g} b_1^s b_1^{s+g}. \tag{7}$$

Let $\pi : \mathcal{N}\times M \to \mathcal{N}$ be the first projection. When $d = 4g-3$ then any $E\in\mathcal{C}^s$ has slope $\mu(E) = d/n > 2\bar{g}$ and thus [8, lemma 5.2] $H^1(M,E)=0$. Hence $\pi_! V$ is a genuine vector bundle over $\mathcal{N}$ of rank $2g-1$ with fibre $H^0(M,E)$ over $[E]\in\mathcal{N}$. We know from [1, prop.9.7] that

$$H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q}) \cong H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})\otimes\mathbf{Q}[a_1]\otimes\Lambda^*\{b_1^1,...,b_1^{2g}\}.$$

The Mumford relations $c_{r,S}$ ($r\geq 2g, S\subseteq[2g]$) are then defined by writing

$$c_r(\pi_! V) = \sum_{S\subseteq[2g]} c_{r,S}\prod_{s\in S} b_1^s, \tag{8}$$

where each $c_{r,S}$ is written in terms of generators for $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})\otimes\mathbf{Q}[a_1]$, namely a_1 and Newstead's generators α,β,ψ_s. In terms of the generators (3) these are given by

$$\alpha = 2f_2 - da_1, \qquad \beta = (a_1)^2 - 4a_2, \qquad \psi_s = 2b_2^s.$$

Kirwan's proof of Mumford's conjecture [6, §2] shows that the Mumford relations together with the normalising relation (7) form a complete set of relations for $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})$. Following Kirwan [6, p.871] we reformulate the definition (8) and write

$$\Psi(t) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} c_r(\pi_V)t^{2g-1-r} = \sum_{r=-\infty}^{\bar{g}} (\sigma_r^0+\sigma_r^1 t)(t^2+a_1t+a_2)^r, \qquad \sigma_r^k = \sum_{S\subseteq[2g]}\sigma_{r,S}^k\prod_{s\in S} b_1^s.$$

We will also refer to $\sigma_{r,S}^k (k=0,1, r<0, S\subseteq[2g])$ as the Mumford relations. (Note σ_r^0 and σ_r^1 differ slightly from Kirwan's terms σ_r and τ_r.) This new formulation will prove more convenient when we need to determine the restrictions of the Mumford relations to various strata. Atiyah and Bott define generators

$$a_1^1, a_1^2, \text{ and } b_1^{1,s}, b_1^{2,s}$$

for $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ via the isomorphism [1, prop.7.12]

$$H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \cong H^*_{\mathcal{G}(1,d_1)}(\mathcal{C}(1,d_1)^{ss};\mathbf{Q})\otimes H^*_{\mathcal{G}(1,d_2)}(\mathcal{C}(1,d_2)^{ss};\mathbf{Q}).$$

In terms of these generators the crucial calculation of Kirwan in her proof of Mumford's conjecture is:

LEMMA 2 (Kirwan) [6, pp.871-873] *Let $\mu=(d_1,d_2)$ and write $D=d_2-2g+1$. Then the restrictions $\sigma_{D,S}^{k,\mu}$ of $\sigma_{D,S}^k$ $(k=0,1)$ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ are given by*

$$\sigma_{D,S}^{0,\mu} = \frac{(-1)^{g\bar{g}/2}}{2^{2g}g!}\left(\prod_{s\notin S}(b_1^{2,s}-b_1^{1,s})\right)a_1^1 e_\mu, \qquad \sigma_{D,S}^{1,\mu} = \frac{(-1)^{g\bar{g}/2}}{2^{2g}g!}\left(\prod_{s\notin S}(b_1^{2,s}-b_1^{1,s})\right)e_\mu. \tag{9}$$

This calculation plays a major role in the following two theorems.

THEOREM 3 *([2], [5], [10], [11].) Each of the sets*

$$\{\zeta_g, \zeta_{g+1}, \zeta_{g+2}\}, \tag{10}$$

$$\{c_{2g,[2g]}, c_{2g+1,[2g]}, c_{2g+2,[2g]}\}, \tag{11}$$

$$\{\sigma^1_{-1,[2g]}, \sigma^0_{-1,[2g]}, \sigma^1_{-2,[2g]}\}, \tag{12}$$

forms a minimal complete set of relations for the invariant cohomology ring $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$.

PROOF: From [11, §6] we know that the relations (10) and (11) generate the same ideal of $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2g,[2g]} &= \sigma^1_{-1,[2g]}, \\ c_{2g+1,[2g]} &= \sigma^0_{-1,[2g]} - a_1\sigma^1_{-1,[2g]}, \\ c_{2g+2,[2g]} &= \sigma^1_{-2,[2g]} - a_1\sigma^0_{-1,[2g]} + ((a_1)^2 - a_2)\sigma^1_{-1,[2g]}, \end{aligned}$$

we can see that the relations (12) also generate the same ideal.

Let $\mu = (d_1, d_2)$. Now $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ is generated by

$$a^1_1, a^2_1, \xi^{1,1}_{1,1}, \xi^{1,2}_{1,1} + \xi^{2,1}_{1,1}, \xi^{2,2}_{1,1},$$

where $\xi^{i,j}_{1,1} = \sum_{s=1}^g b^{i,s}_1 b^{j,s+g}_1$. On restriction to $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$

$$a_1 \mapsto a^1_1 + a^2_1, \qquad b^s_1 \mapsto b^{1,s}_1 + b^{2,s}_1, \qquad f_2 \mapsto d_1 a^2_1 + d_2 a^1_1 + \xi^{1,2}_{1,1} + \xi^{2,1}_{1,1}.$$

Hence $e_\mu H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ is generated by

$$\sum_{\substack{S\subseteq[g]\\|S|=k}} \left(\prod_{s\in S} b^{1,s}_1 b^{1,s+g}_1 - b^{2,s}_1 b^{2,s+g}_1\right) (a^1_1)^i e_\mu \tag{13}$$

for $i = 0, 1$, $0 \le k \le g$ and the restrictions of a_1, f_2 and $\xi_{1,1} = \sum_{s=1}^g b^s_1 b^{s+g}_1$. Let $P(S)$ denote the set of partitions S into two sets S_1, S_2. We then see from lemma 2 that (13) above is the restriction of

$$\frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{\substack{S\subseteq[g]\\|S|=k}} \sum_{P(S)} (\pm) \left(\prod_{s\in S_1} b^s_1\right) \left(\prod_{s\in S_2} b^{s+g}_1\right) \sigma^i_{D,[2g]-(S_2\cup(S_1+g))} \tag{14}$$

where the sign $(\pm)$ depends on the particular partition of S. Thus by proposition 1 the relations (14) above for $D < 0$, $i = 0, 1$, $0 \le k \le g$ generate the invariant relation ideal of

$$H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q}) \cong H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q}) \otimes \Lambda^*\{b^1_1, \ldots, b^{2g}_1\} \otimes \mathbf{Q}[a_1].$$

In particular the relations

$$\left\{\sigma^i_{D,[2g]} : D < 0, i = 0, 1\right\}$$

generate $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$. It follows from (1) that the sets (10), (11) and (12) each form a complete set of relations for the invariant cohomology ring of $\mathcal{N}_0$.

Minimality then follows easily. Suppose that for some $\eta, \theta \in H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})^\Gamma$ we have

$$\sigma^1_{-2,[2g]} + \eta\sigma^0_{-1,[2g]} + \theta\sigma^1_{-1,[2g]} = 0. \tag{15}$$

So η has degree 2 and θ has degree 4.

Let $\mu = (2\bar{g}+1, 2\bar{g})$. Restricting equation (15) to $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ we find from (9) that

$$\eta_\mu a^1_1 + \theta_\mu = 0 \tag{16}$$

since e_μ is not a zero-divisor in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$. The restriction map

$$H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q}) \to H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q}) \tag{17}$$

is given by

$$a_1 \mapsto a_1^1 + a_1^2, \qquad a_2 \mapsto a_1^1 a_1^2, \qquad f_2 \mapsto 2\bar{g}a_1^1 + (2\bar{g}+1)a_1^2 + \xi_{1,1}^{1,2} + \xi_{1,1}^{2,1},$$

$$b_1^s \mapsto b_1^{1,s} + b_1^{2,s}, \qquad b_2^s \mapsto a_1^2 b_1^{1,s} + a_1^1 b_1^{2,s}.$$

From (16) we see that η_μ and θ_μ are both zero. Since the restriction map (17) is injective in degrees 4 and less, we have that η and θ are both zero – which contradicts (15).

Similarly the equation

$$\sigma^0_{-1,[2g]} + \eta\sigma^1_{-1,[2g]} = 0$$

has no solutions for $\eta \in H^2_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})$. $\square$

3 Mumford's Conjecture

The final result of this note is a stronger version of Mumford's conjecture as proven by Kirwan [6, §2] and which is confusingly also referred to as Mumford's conjecture.

The Poincaré polynomial of the relation ideal of $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})$ equals [1, p.593]

$$\frac{t^{2g}(1+t)^{2g}}{(1-t^2)(1-t^4)}.$$

Now there are $\binom{2g}{r}$ relations of the form $c_{2g,S}$ of degree $2g+r$; α has degree two, β has degree four and neither are nilpotent in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})$. This strongly suggests:

THEOREM 4 *The relation ideal of $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})$ is freely generated as a $\mathbf{Q}[\alpha,\beta]$-module by the Mumford relations $c_{2g,S}$ for $S \subseteq [2g]$.*

PROOF: Define

$$\bar{\alpha} = \alpha - \sum_{s=1}^{g} b_1^s b_1^{s+g} = 2f_2 - da_1 - \sum_{s=1}^{g} b_1^s b_1^{s+g}.$$

We will show that the relations $c_{2g,S}$ generate the relation ideal of $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}^s;\mathbf{Q})$ as a $\mathbf{Q}[\bar{\alpha},\beta]$-module. As $\bar{\alpha}$ restricts to α in $H^*(\mathcal{N}_0;\mathbf{Q})$ then this is equivalent to the above result. It will be sufficient to prove that

$$\sum_{S\subseteq[2g]} \lambda_S(\bar{\alpha},\beta)c_{2g,S} = 0 \qquad \lambda_S(\bar{\alpha},\beta) \in \mathbf{Q}[\bar{\alpha},\beta] \tag{18}$$

in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C};\mathbf{Q})$ if and only if $\lambda_S(\bar{\alpha},\beta) = 0$ for each $S \subseteq [2g]$.

Let $\mu = (2\bar{g}+1, 2\bar{g})$. Then from lemma 2 we know that the restriction of $c_{2g,S} = \sigma^1_{-1,S}$ in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ equals

$$\frac{(-1)^{g\bar{g}/2}}{2^{2g}g!}\left(\prod_{s\notin S}(b_1^{2,s} - b_1^{1,s})\right)e_\mu.$$

If we restrict equation (18) to $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ and recall that e_μ is not a zero-divisor in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ [1, p.569] we obtain

$$\sum_{S\subseteq[2g]} \lambda_S(\bar{\alpha}_\mu,\beta_\mu)\left(\prod_{s\notin S}(b_1^{2,s} - b_1^{1,s})\right) = 0.$$

Now the restrictions of $\bar{\alpha}$ and β in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}_\mu;\mathbf{Q})$ equal

$$\bar{\alpha}_\mu = (a_1^2 - a_1^1) - \sum_{s=1}^{g}(b_1^{1,s} - b_1^{2,s})(b_1^{1,s+g} - b_1^{2,s+g}), \qquad \beta_\mu = (a_1^2 - a_1^1)^2. \tag{19}$$

By comparing the coefficients of $\prod_{s\in S}(b_1^{2,s} - b_1^{1,s})$ for each $S \subseteq [2g]$ we see that

$$\lambda_S(\bar{\alpha}_\mu,\beta_\mu) = 0 \qquad S \subseteq [2g].$$

Consider the restriction map

$$\mathbf{Q}[\bar{\alpha},\beta] \to \mathbf{Q}[\bar{\alpha}_\mu,\beta_\mu]. \tag{20}$$

From the expressions (19) of $\bar{\alpha}_\mu$ and β_μ we can see that the kernel of the restriction map (20) is the ideal of $\mathbf{Q}[\bar{\alpha}, \beta]$ generated by

$$(\bar{\alpha}^2 - \beta)^{g+1}.$$

However $\bar{\alpha}^2 - \beta$ is not a zero-divisor in $H^*_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{C}; \mathbf{Q})$. So we can assume without any loss of generality that for some S, λ_S is either zero or not in the ideal generated by $\bar{\alpha}^2 - \beta$. For this S we have $\lambda_S = 0$ since $\lambda_S(\bar{\alpha}_\mu, \beta_\mu) = 0$. Inductively we can see that

$$\lambda_S(\bar{\alpha}, \beta) = 0 \text{ for } S \subseteq [2g]. \qquad \square$$

References

[1] M.F.Atiyah and R.Bott *The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces* Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **308** (1982) 523-615.

[2] V.Baranovsky *Cohomology ring of the moduli space of stable vector bundles with odd determinant* Izv. Russ. Acad. Nauk. **58 n4** (1994) 204-210.

[3] R.A.Earl *The Mumford relations and the moduli of rank three stable bundles* Compositio Math. (to appear).

[4] G.Harder and M.S.Narasimhan *On the cohomology groups of moduli spaces of vector bundles over curves* Math. Ann. **212** (1975) 215-248.

[5] A.D.King and P.E.Newstead *On the cohomology of the moduli space of rank 2 vector bundles on a curve* (1995 preprint).

[6] F.C.Kirwan *Cohomology rings of moduli spaces of bundles over Riemann surfaces* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **5** (1992) 853-906.

[7] P.E.Newstead *Characteristic classes of stable bundles of rank 2 over an algebraic curve* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **169** (1972) 337-345.

[8] P.E.Newstead *Introduction to moduli problems and orbit spaces* Tata Inst. Lect. 51 1978.

[9] S.S.Shatz *The decomposition and specialization of algebraic families of vector bundles* Compositio Math. **35** (1977) 163-187.

[10] B.Siebert and G.Tian *Recursive relations for the cohomology ring of moduli spaces of stable bundles* (1994 preprint).

[11] D.Zagier *On the cohomology of moduli spaces of rank 2 vector bundles over curves* (1995 preprint).

Mathematical Institute,
24-29 St. Giles,
Oxford,
OX1 3LB,
England,

earl@maths.ox.ac.uk